UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,422	05/25/2007	Pertti Hasanen	PAT155USA	7029
24339 JOEL D. SKIN	7590 07/29/200 NER. JR.	EXAMINER		
SKINNER ANI	D ASSOCIATES	ANDERSON, AMBER R		
212 COMMER HUDSON, WI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3765	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/590,422	HASANEN, PERTTI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
AMBER R. ANDERSON	3765		

	AMBER R. ANDERSON	3765	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a d			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 Soo attached Notice of Non Co	mpliant Amondment (DTOL 324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		Inpliant Amendment (1	1 OL-324).
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-5. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/GARY L. WELCH/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3765			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's First Argument: The weight is of a magnitude to provide a therapeutically effecting amount of muscular training. Examiner's Response: The term "heavy" is a relative term. The material of the pads of Carrington and Fee et al. could be considered as heavy to a person with very low strength or to a child. Therefore, heavy does not distinguish over the prior art. Further, the applicant adds the limitations of "heavy material" and "having a weight sufficient for effective muscular training but fails to mention what the material is or how much a sufficient weight is. A sufficient weight can vary from person to person, i.e. for a child could be just a few pounds, 2lbs, and for a trained athlete could be tens of pounds, 20lbs, etc. Thus, these new limitations do not distinguish over the prior art.

Applicant's Second Argument: The trousers are a form of apparel that are designed to be worn on the outside as an outer garment. Examiner's Response: The garments of Carrington and Fee et al. are capable of being worn as outer garments. Further, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).